

From: Lee Pauser
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/6/01 4:27pm
Subject: [Fwd: MS vs DOJ]

To whom it may concern,

Below is my comments regarding the proposed Microsoft Antitrust settlement:

1. The settlement (like the previous settlement) does not punish Microsoft for its past transgressions. It is has monopoly powers, and abuses them.
2. Giving software to schools is a low cost item to Microsoft because it doesn't cost much to burn another CD. It also helps entrench their products, and hinders competitor's products.
3. Years ago I bought a Dell computer. I wanted to buy it without Windows because I ran IBM's OS/2, but was told that I would have to pay more if I didn't get it with Windows. (Does this make sense???) So I bought it with Windows for a lesser price, and then formatted the hard disk, and installed OS/2. Effectively I had to buy Windows, but I didn't want it. This settlement in no way punishes Microsoft for their consumer unfriendly licensing agreements, nor reimburses me for my having to buy Windows.
4. When I bought Window/ME, it included Internet Explorer, and other applets which I don't want. I use Netscape, and always have. I am being forced to have IE when I don't want it. The other applets that Microsoft includes are shallow in function, and I purchase more robust products when I need them. However, I pay an increased cost for things that I don't want.
5. Microsoft has a practice of initially providing new applets for free- e.g. IE and their multimedia player. (It cost Microsoft \$10million to develop IE, and they gave it away for 'free'- Over charging for other products made up the \$10million.). This practice either hinders or drives the competition out of business- e.g. Netscape, Apple Quicktime, RealPlayer. Later the applet gets included in their OS- Windows/W2k/XP. We need to keep the OS and applets separate products, and let me buy what I want/need. (If I buy a car, I can get an after market CD player if I want to- I don't have to buy the manufacturer's CD player.)
6. This settlement is a farce, and is a political solution- not a solution mandated by the antitrust laws.
7. The judge overseeing the settlement is inexperienced and unqualified for an antitrust case of this proportions.
8. Microsoft claims to be innovative- they are very innovative at developing ideas of others, and masking unfair their trade practices.
9. What is good for Microsoft is not good for the nation.
10. I urge the remaining 9 states, and the EU to aggressively pursue a settlement worthy of Microsoft's flagrant behavior.

Thank you for hearing me out. I have little faith left in the court system, and that my comments will sway any decision.

Leon Pauser